



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.        | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.  | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|------------------------|-------------|----------------------|----------------------|------------------|
| 09/701,921             | 12/04/2000  | Yumi Wakita          | MTS-3226US           | 1348             |
| 52473                  | 7590        | 11/16/2005           | EXAMINER             |                  |
| RATNERPRESTIA          |             |                      | OPSASNICK, MICHAEL N |                  |
| P.O. BOX 980           |             |                      | ART UNIT             |                  |
| VALLEY FORGE, PA 19482 |             |                      | PAPER NUMBER         |                  |

2655

DATE MAILED: 11/16/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

09/701,921

**Applicant(s)**

WAKITA, YUMI

**Examiner**

Michael N. Opsasnick

**Art Unit**

2655

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on received on 9/2/05.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 and 12-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 10, 11 and 15 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Allowable Subject Matter*

1. Claims 10,11,15 are allowed over the prior art of record. As per the independent claims, the prior art of record does not explicitly teach the semantic coding section in relation to the morphological analyzing section. Claim 11 is allowable over the prior art of record because it depends from claim 10, which has been determined to be allowable over the prior art of record.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-5,14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kutsumi et al (5353221) in view of Su et al (5418717).

As per claims 1,14, Kutsumi et al (5353221) teaches:

“a language transferring....speech or text” as using semantic analysis (Fig. 2, L4)  
for translation (abstract)

Art Unit: 2655

“a language transferring section which transfer....section” as using the language rules (col. 7 lines 1-35; examiner notes that the apparatus uses a storage section to execute the rules)

As per claims 1,14, Kutsumi et al (5353221) also teaches automatically paring a source language sentence with a target language sentence (col. 16 lines 50-55; examiner notes that Kutsumi teaches both automatic and manual process → the manual process is not invoked until an erroneous recognition); however, Kutsumi et al (5353221) does not explicitly teach a speech recognition system to output the results of the language processing, however, Su et al (5418717) teaches a language processing/translation (abstract) that performs speech recognition (col. 7 lines 34-47). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of language processing to modify the teachings of Kutsumi et al (5353221) with speech recognition because it would advantageously allow for the scoring output to be based on speech input (Su et al (5418717), col. 7 line 65 – col. 8 line 2)

As per claim 2, Kutsumi et al (5353221) teaches:

“characterized....style independent phrases” as level L6 semantic translation is independent (col. 5 lines 20-28).

As per claim 3, Kutsumi et al (5353221) teaches parallel or concurrent semantic rules for the independent phrases (Fig. 9, subblock S3; col. 5 lines 20-28)

Art Unit: 2655

As per claim 4, Kutsumi et al (5353221) does not explicitly teach a speech synthesis system to output the results of the language processing, however, Su et al (5418717) teaches a language processing/translation (abstract) that performs speech synthesis (col. 7 lines 34-47). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of language processing to modify the teachings of Kutsumi et al (5353221) with speech recognition because it would advantageously allow for the scoring output to be audibly heard (Su et al (5418717), col. 7 line 65 – col. 8 line 2).

As per claim 5, Kutsumi et al (5353221) teaches:

“characterized in that.....language rule group” as multiple rules (col. 10 lines 1-30) in which the rules are enforced by a tree search in a bottom-up manner;

“an optimum rule.....distance” as combining the results of buffer F+G into a combined set of rules (col. 6 line 35 – col. 7 line 65; Fig. 9, subblock 518 and 519).

4. Claims 6-9,12,13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kutsumi et al (5353221) in view of McCarley (6349276).

As per claim 6, Kutsumi et al (5353221) teaches:

“a language transference rule” as using semantic analysis (Fig. 2, L4) for translation (abstract)

“a parallel-translation corpus” as parallel comparison (Fig. 9, subblock S3)

Art Unit: 2655

“a phrase extracting section.....phrase” as determining part of speech (fig. 10, subblock S13) and as giving more weight to a result based on both the first and second part of speech (col. 3 lines 1-7)

“a phrase determining section.....phrases” as comparing the phrases with a first and second part of speech (col. 3 lines 48-59);

“a phrase dictionary....phrases” as dictionary (Fig. 3, subblock 151)

“said phrase dictionary....style transference” as dictionary being accessed for matching the corresponding phrases (Fig. 4)

As per claim 6, Kutsumi et al (5353221) phrase dictionary does not necessarily stored phrases for language comparison or transference, however, McCarley (6349276), teaches language transfer corpus (McCarley (6349276), Fig. 3, Fig. 4). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of translation at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Kutsumi et al (5353221) with language translation based dictionaries because it would advantageously provide a system that could handle multiple language translations (McCarley (6349276), col. 2 lines 8-24).

As per claim 7, Kutsumi et al (5353221) teaches:

“characterized.....phrases” as checking for parallel possibilities of phrase matching (col. 7 lines 45-51)

As per claim 8, Kutsumi et al (5353221) teaches:

“characterized.....word string” as a morphological analyzing section which transfers (col. 6, lines 30-42)

“word clustering.....part names” as analyzing and grouping according to part of speech (Col. 6 lines 43-65)

“said phrase extracting.....part of speech” as performing and extracting according to part of speech (col. 10 lines 34-64).

As per claim 9, Kutsumi et al (5353221) teaches:

“characterized in that said apparatus has a parallel translation....word clustering.....speech part names” as basing the part of speech replacement according to both part of speech and content (Col. 10 line 52 – col. 11 line 6; and Fig. 2, subblock L5).

As per claim 12, Kutsumi et al (5353221) teaches:

“characterized in that said phrase.....target language” as comparing the phrases with a first and second part of speech (col. 3 lines 48-59) with a parallel comparison (Fig. 9, subblock S3)

As per claim 13, Kutsumi et al (5353221) teaches:

“characterized in that said apparatus has a perplexity calculating section.....perplexity” as multiple rules (col. 16 lines 1-30) wherein the matching is determined by the order of the part of speech, based on a bottom-up tree search.

***Response to Arguments***

5. Applicant's arguments filed 9/2/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. As per applicant's arguments that Kutsumi does not teach automatic pairing, examiner argues that Kutsumi teaches both automatic and manual pairing, the manual pairing used to correct erroneous recognition → and therefore the claim scope is met. With respect to applicant's arguments that McCarley and Kutsumi are not in the same field of endeavor, examiner argues that both reference are common to the art of language translation information systems. The claim scope of claim 14 is inherently taught in the cited passages as applied to the independent claims, as noted above.

***Conclusion***

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,



Art Unit: 2655


however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael Opsasnick, telephone number (571)272-7623, who is available Tuesday-Thursday, 9am-4pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mr. Wayne Young, can be reached at (571)272-7582. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

mno  
11/13/05



W. R. YOUNG  
PRIMARY EXAMINER